IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Boubez et al.** §	
§	Group Art Unit: **3691**
Serial No. **09/753,964** §	
§	Examiner: **Hamilton, Lalita M.**
Filed: **January 3, 2001** §	
§	
For: **Apparatus and Method for** §	
Verifying Categorization of Services §	
Using Canonical Service Description §	
Tests §	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

36736
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

REPLY BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.41)

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on December 27, 2006.

No fees are believed to be required to file a Reply Brief. If any fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

In the Examiner's Answer filed December 27, 2006, the Examiner continues to contend that all of claims 1-30 of the present application are anticipated by the disclosure in paragraphs [0026]-[0032] of Poon, U.S. Patent Application Publication No.2002/0062265 A1. With respect to claim 1, in particular, the Examiner appears to assert on page 5 of the Examiner's Answer that the steps recited in the claim are fully disclosed in paragraph [0029] in Poon. Appellants respectfully disagree.

In the Appeal Brief filed February 14, 2006, Appellants asserted that Poon did not anticipate claim 1 because Poon does disclose or suggest, either in paragraph [0029] or elsewhere in the reference, the claimed steps of "receiving a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered", "applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category", and "registering the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category."

With respect to the claimed step of "receiving a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered", Appellants pointed out that Poon describes a mechanism by which a user selects a category from a list of categories. In addition, Poon discloses that if the selected category has subcategories, the user is able to select from the subcategories. Appellants further pointed out that this process is initiated based on a decision whether a category number is available to the user, and that the missing category number that starts the process enables the user to select the associated category and subcategories without going through the entire selection process. Thus, Appellants pointed out that while the selection of a category might be construed as a request, the request does not include a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered as required by claim 1.

With respect to the claim limitation "applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category", Appellants pointed out that the server of Poon merely determines if there are related subcategories associated with the category selection received from the user, and that Poon does not disclose applying a test to a service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category as there is no service description received from the client in the Poon system.

With respect to the claim limitation "registering the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category", Appellants pointed out that Poon merely receives a category selection and does not apply one or more canonical service description tests to determine that a service description should be registered in the identified category. Poon relies on the user to determine what category an item should be listed in.

In responding to these various arguments in the Appeal Brief, the Examiner, on pages 4-5 of the Examiner's Answer, simply refers to paragraph [0029] in Poon but does not specifically respond to Appellants' arguments pointing out the deficiencies in Poon. For example, the Examiner does not explain how paragraph [0029] in Poon discloses receiving a registration request that includes a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered as recited in claim 1. Appellants continue to submit that the paragraph does not, in fact, contain such a disclosure. As indicated in the Appeal Brief, there is no service description received from the client in the Poon system. Furthermore, because there is no service description received from the client, Poon also does not disclose "applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category", or "registering the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category." As indicated above, Poon relies on the user to determine what category an item should be listed in, and does not apply one or more canonical service description tests to determine if a service description should be registered.

Appellants again respectfully submit that Poon simply does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 1 or in independent claims 11 and 21, and that the claims patentably distinguish over Poon in their present form. In addition, by virtue of their dependency and for the reasons set for the in the Appeal Brief, Appellants also respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30 patentably distinguish over Poon in their present form.

For at least the reasons set forth above and in the Appeal Brief, Appellants submit that claims 1-30 are not anticipated by Poon, and it is respectfully requested that the Board reverse the Examiner's Final Rejection of those claims.

/Gerald H. Glanzman/

Attorney
Reg. No. 25,035
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777